

Application No. 09/887,977
Amendment dated January 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Docket No.: 0941-0293P

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-14 and 16 are now present in this application.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 11 and 16 have been amended. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendment

Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, and 16 have been amended for clarity. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced.

Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Tayloe, U.S. Patent 5,987,325, in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Tayloe in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, and further in view of Phillips et al., U.S. Patent 6,400,965. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 8, and 16

The present application discloses a method and apparatus for switching between multiple SIM cards within a telephone. The method comprises storing a plurality of internal ID codes, each of which identifies a direct service provider of one of the SIM cards, and storing a priority table comprising priorities of cooperation of the SIM cards with the compatible service provider.

Application No. 09/887,977
Amendment dated January 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Docket No.: 0941-0293P

Here, the stored priority table contains prioritized arrangement of cooperation between the SIM cards and their respective compatible service providers. According to the techniques provided in the present application, the arrangement of cooperation is prioritized in the priority table, but not the service providers. It is noted that this mentioned technique is not disclosed in Tayloe.

Furthermore, the Examiner interprets the "best network" of Tayloe as being equivalent to "a service provider" in the present application. It is noted that the service provider, however, is already identified or determined by the received ID code without depending on the priority table based on the present application. Accordingly, the telephone does not select the service provider ("best network") and the suitable SIM card is switched to according to the priorities. Conversely, Tayloe teaches that a best network is selected when SIMs are given more than one network (see col. 4, lines 26-47). It is therefore respectfully submitted that Tayloe is different from the present application in this regard.

Moreover, the Examiner admits that Tayloe does not disclose switching to one of the SIM cards according to the priorities, but cites that the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art teaches selecting a SIM card with which the user can make the least expensive call (page 1, line 28 - page 3, line 2). It is noted that the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art does not disclose switching to one of the SIM cards according to the priorities indeed. The Applicant's Admitted Prior Art describes problems of current mobile phones (see page 1, line 28 - page 3, line 2), such as "the mobile phone user switches SIM cards by first turning off the power, removing the battery, then pulling out the old card and finally inserting a new card", but does not disclose any features regarding the priorities.

Application No. 09/887,977
Amendment dated January 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Docket No.: 0941-0293P

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the prior art utilized by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 16 of the present application.

Claims 4 and 11

The Examiner cites that Tayloe in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art discloses that the priorities corresponding to fee rates under the cooperation of the SIM cards with the compatible service provider and the fee rate of the cooperation of the SIM card switched to with the compatible service provider is lowest. Because the priorities are not disclosed in Tayloe or the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, the limitations disclosed in claims 4 and 11 are different from the techniques disclosed in Tayloe and/or the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

Claims 7 and 14

The Examiner cites that Tayloe in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art suggests that the switching of the SIM cards is activated immediately after a Send key of the telephone is pressed. In the present application, the switching of the SIM cards is activated immediately after a Send key of the telephone is pressed, and the switching is according to the priorities. Tayloe in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art suggests that a SIM card is first selected based on some factors, and is then switched thereto. Thus, Tayloe in view of the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art is substantially different from the present application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art utilized by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the method and apparatus of

Application No. 09/887,977
Amendment dated January 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 18, 2005

Docket No.: 0941-0293P

independent claims 1, 8 and 16, as well as their dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Murcy
Registration No.: 32,334
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant